	Case 2:20-cv-00714-TLN-JDP Documer	nt 29 Filed 09/14/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD,	No. 2:20-cv-00714-TLN-JDP
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER
14	S. GEE, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Raymond Alford Bradford ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has	
18	filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a	
19	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On August 26, 2021, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein	
21	which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the	
22	findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 27.) On	
23	September 3, 2021, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations (ECF No. 28), ¹	
24	which have been considered by the Court.	
25		
26	The filing purports to seek relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) but based on the timing and content of the filing, is construed as objections to the findings and recommendations. Further, to the extent that Plaintiff is asserting a motion under Rule 60(b), such motion is DENIED as premature.	
27		
28		
		1

Case 2:20-cv-00714-TLN-JDP Document 29 Filed 09/14/21 Page 2 of 2

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304(f), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. *See McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982); *see also Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). Having reviewed the file under the applicable legal standards, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed August 26, 2021 (ECF No. 27), are ADOPTED IN FULL;
- 2. Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 23) is DISMISSED without leave to Amend;
 - 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF No. 25) is DENIED; and
 - 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 13, 2021

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge